



DOCKET NO.: 202887US-2

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313

RE: U.S. Application
Serial No: 09/778,104
Filed: FEBRUARY 7, 2001
Group: 2826
Inventor: YUICHI HIRANO ET AL.
For: SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE AND
METHOD OF MANUFACTURING SAME



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

GREGORY J. MAIER
(703) 413-3000
GMAIER@OBLON.COM

RONALD A. RUDDER, Ph.D.
REGISTERED PATENT AGENT
(703) 412-7033
RRUDDER@OBLON.COM

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Our check in the amount of \$_____ is attached covering any required fees. In the event that any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 CFR 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Attorney of Record
Ronald A. Rudder, Ph.D.
Registration No. 45,618



22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax No: (703) 413-2220
GJM:RAR:clh

RECEIVED
AUG 18 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF: :
YUUCHI HIRANO ET AL : EXAMINER: MANDALA, VICTOR A.
SERIAL NO. : 09/778,104 :
FILED: FEBRUARY 7, 2001 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2826
FOR: SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE AND:
METHOD OF MANUFACTURING
SAME :

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313

SIR:

This communication is responsive to the final Official Action dated May 16, 2003.

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are presently active. Claims 3, 4, and 7-13 having been previously withdrawn from consideration.

In the outstanding final Office Action, Claims 1-2 and 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Figure 29 in view of Tsukada et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,266,825).

Firstly, Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy of Examiner Mandala and Supervisory Patent Examiner Flynn to conduct an interview on this case on June 5, 2003. During the interview, the issues identified in the outstanding Office Action were discussed. Applicants' representative discussed why the teachings in Tsukada et al for an offset are directed to offsets between the drain (or source) electrode and the first and second gates, and

RECEIVED
AUG 18 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2000

Application No. 09/778,104
Reply to Office Action of May 16, 2003

therefore are not related to the recited second part of the drain region defined in Claim 1. As indicated on the Interview Summary Sheet, an agreement was reached that the prior art reference of Tsukada et al was not teaching the same material as thought in the outstanding 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection, and that the rejection would be withdrawn.

Accordingly, Claim 1 and Claims 2 and 5-6 which depend from Claim 1 are believed to patentably define over the applied prior art.

Further, it is requested that non-elected Claims 3, 4, and 7-11 which depend from Claim 1 be rejoined and allowed due to their dependence on Claim 1.

Consequently in view of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Attorney of Record
Ronald A. Rudder, Ph. D.
Registration No. 45,618



22850

(703) 413-3000
Fax #: (703) 413-2220
GJM/RAR:clh
I:\attyl\RAR\amendments\202887US\rfi.wpd